

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

VINCENT H. PINDER,

Petitioner,

vs.

BILL DONAT, et al.,

Respondents.

Case No. 3:06-CV-00213-LRH-(RAM)

ORDER

Before the Court are Petitioner's Motion for Relief from Judgment (#27) pursuant to Rule 60(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Respondents' Opposition (#29). On November 27, 2007, Petitioner filed simultaneously a Motion to Allow/File a Late Reply (#20) and the Reply (#22) itself. On June 24, 2008, this Court entered an Order (#23) that granted Petitioner's Motion (#20) and denied the Amended Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus (#10) on the merits. On September 22, 2008, Petitioner filed a Motion for Extension/Enlargement of Time (#25). The Court denied (#26) that motion because the action had been closed, nothing was pending, and Petitioner did not state why he needed an enlargement. In Petitioner's current Motion (#27), he expresses confusion because he thought that he had permission from the granting of his Motion to Allow/File Late Reply (#20) to file yet another reply to the Answer (#17). The Court's granting of the Motion (#20) made his simultaneously submitted Reply (#22) properly filed. The Court did not give Petitioner permission to file a second reply. Given that the Court was denying the Amended Petition (#10) at the same time, such permission would have been pointless.

1 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Petitioner's Motion for Relief from Judgment (#27) is
2 **DENIED.**

3 DATED this 26th day of October, 2009.



LARRY R. HICKS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE